

1  
2  
3  
4  
5 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
6 FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
7

8 JANE DOE,

No. C 07-05596 SI

9 Plaintiff,

**ORDER RE: PLAINTIFF'S MOTION TO  
COMPEL**

10 v.

**(Docket No. 358)**

11 CITY OF SAN MATEO, et al.,

12 Defendants.  
13 \_\_\_\_\_/

14 Plaintiff has filed a discovery letter seeking to compel defendant City of San Mateo to provide  
15 a response to plaintiff's Interrogatory No. 6, which asked defendant to "Identify each communication  
16 [it] participated in, or know[s] of, concerning of the Plaintiff's alleged wrongful acts." The City's  
17 response to this interrogatory was an objection stating, "This interrogatory is overly broad, not  
18 reasonably limited in scope or time, and as such is invasive of the attorney-client privilege and the  
19 attorney work product immunity." *See* Def. Ex. A at 5.


20 The City has attached other discovery responses, including its detailed response to Interrogatory  
21 No. 5 and San Mateo Police Officer Murphy's response to Interrogatory No. 10 which plaintiffs  
22 propounded to him. These responses demonstrate that plaintiff already has the information which she  
23 seeks through the present motion. Accordingly, the motion to compel is DENIED.

24 The City seeks sanctions against plaintiff in the amount of \$940, representing the attorneys' fees  
25 and costs it incurred in connection with this motion. Civil Local Rule 7-8(a), however, requires that any  
26 request for sanctions be brought through a separately filed and noticed motion. Indeed, the City has a  
27 pending motion for sanctions in connection with other discovery-related conduct by plaintiff. (Docket  
28 No. 351). Accordingly, the City's request for sanctions in connection with plaintiff's filing of the

1 present letter brief is DENIED at this time.

2  
3 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

4  
5 Dated: September 15, 2010

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
SUSAN ILLSTON  
United States District Judge